



# **CITY OF NEWPORT BEACH**

## **City Hall Design Committee**

Minutes of the City Hall Design Committee meeting held in the City Council Chambers, City of Newport Beach, on July 28, 2008, 6:00 p.m.

### **1. Call to Order**

Members present:

Larry Tucker, Chairman  
Andy Bowden, Landscape Architect  
Walt Richardson, Architect  
Stephen Sandland, Architect  
Linda Taylor, Architect

Staff present:

Dave Kiff, Assistant City Manager  
Steve Badum, Public Works Director  
Shirley Oborny, Administrative Assistant

Members of the Public:

Brian Hayen  
Bill Ficker  
Ron and Novell Hendrickson  
Roberta Jorgensen  
Marty Kurner  
Jim Maloney  
Gregory Mattola  
Dolores Otting  
Jan Vandersloot  
Jim Wirick

### **2. Approval of Past Meeting's Minutes**

No minutes were presented for approval.

### **3. Public Comments on Non Agenda Items**

In response to Mr. Hendrickson, Mr. Kiff said the firms recommended at the last meeting were as follows, in no particular order:

- LPA
- Rossetti
- Gonzales Goodale Architects
- Johnson Fain
- Bohlin Cywinski Jackson

#### **4. City Hall & Park Master Plan Project**

Mr. Kiff updated the committee on the status of the process:

- in June, the City Council selected the same five firms recommended by the committee;
- contracts were sent to all five firms and most have been signed and returned;
- each firm has been in contact with the City and seems to be excited about the project.

#### **Review of and suggested answers to questions submitted by any one of the five firms participating in the Design Competition.**

*1. Will there be any guidelines/limitations/formats for the presentation of competition deliverables and design concepts?*

Mr. Ficker suggested the firms leave behind exhibit boards of their presentations to be displayed at the library and/or City Hall. He also suggested the orientation of their displays should face the site as if entering from Avocado Street. Mr. Richardson agreed. Ms. Taylor expressed her concern over requiring the firms to present boards which might prevent them from displaying their plans in a more creative way. She agreed the public needs a means to view the plans and compare them.

Mr. Sandland suggested the two sets of mounting board displays be a maximum of 30"x42" that depict the site plan, building floor plans and the building elevations. Mr. Bowden said one of the boards should be the conceptual landscape plan. Mr. Richardson suggested bound copies of the entire presentation be left behind for the committee's review. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Tucker said there will be many opportunities for the public to view the presentations via television, electronically and through hard copy displays. The goal is for everybody to become very familiar with what the designs are. There will be one presentation by each firm and the City Council members will be invited to attend to observe those presentations.

*2. Will any exceptions to the height limits imposed on this site in general be allowed for trees or other landscape features or amenities?*

Mr. Badum said the only exception is the provision allowing architectural features to extend beyond the View Plane limitation. He would like to ask the Building Committee for clarification. Mr. Bowden said typically the plant material cannot exceed the height of the building.

*3. We would like staff to clarify building height restrictions for the proposed City Hall and Park Master Plan...*

Mr. Badum said he doesn't know of any location where the topography encroaches upon the view plane. "Extensive grading will be needed on the site," he said. The committee agreed. Dr. Vandersloot said he thinks the public expects to see the same view after construction as they see now when they drive down MacArthur Boulevard; grass and the

ocean, not buildings, because the slope would hide City Hall. Chairman Tucker said he doesn't think that constraint was included by the Building Committee.

*4. Please clarify where the "southernmost meadow" area is located.*

Mr. Sandland said it's located in the General Design Parameters in section F. Mr. Kiff said he'd highlight the area and post it on the web.

*5. Please clarify the intent of the video. How will it factor into the evaluation of the competition submittals?*

Chairman Tucker and Mr. Kiff said the video would be used to make a file and then shown on the webpage and on NBTv. Mr. Kiff said the video could be spliced into the taping of the presentations for better quality and the small video segments could be uploaded onto the Internet. Mr. Sandland said the other intent was to have the capability to walk through different parts of the building or site in a three dimensional or interactive method, if possible. Mr. Bowden said he thinks the question is more to do with how the video will factor into the evaluation. He thinks the hard copies and design content are important, not necessarily the quality of the video.

*6. May we get the topographic map for the north parcel of the City?*

Mr. Kiff said it will be made available.

*7. Please clarify the competition submittal exhibits requirements.*

Mr. Sandland said this question is addressed in question number 1.

*8. Please clarify the format required for submission at competition deadline. Is submission limited to a "10-15 minute highlight video" and "45 minute presentation"? Are hard copies of presentation required?*

Ms. Taylor said she thinks this question asks if the 10-15 minute video needs to be shown within the 45-minute presentation or in addition to the 45-minute presentation. She said the short video could be part of the 45-minute presentation. Chairman Tucker agreed that hard copies of the presentation are required.

*9. Is a cost estimate required?*

In response the concerns of Ms. Otting, Mr. Hendrickson and Mr. Hayden over the importance of cost estimates being required, discussion ensued. Mr. Sandland said the firms should look at the Design Criteria, "Practicality, Efficiency and Constructability" and address those issues. Ms. Taylor suggested it be phrased to emphasize the importance of having the backup included because it's part of the evaluation.

*10. Please clarify "activity-oriented amenities" in the park, stated in the Design Parameters.*

Mr. Bowden said the Building Committee could expand upon this but he interprets it to mean hiking trails, picnic facilities, amphitheater, etc. Mr. Kiff said the City Council talked about it and decided to keep it broad. Mr. Richardson suggested they review Sections F, G and H in the Design Parameters where examples are given.

*11. Has the individual presentation dates to the Design Committee/City Council been determined?*

Mr. Tucker said this would be discussed later in the agenda but he did indicate all five presentations would be given on the same day.

*12. Please clarify discrepancy in program square footage of council chambers: 5,575 SF vs. 6,663 SF*

Mr. Badum said it's 5,575 SF. Mr. Richardson said it states 150 seats are needed in the Needs Assessment.

*13. Please clarify future expansion requirements for the City Hall building and for the existing Library building.*

Mr. Badum said they are listed in the Needs Assessment for the City Hall and there are no plans to expand the existing library. Mr. Hendrickson said he doesn't feel they should have to search through the Needs Assessment. It should be included in the Design Criteria. He also inquired as to where the square footage would come from for the connection between the library and City Hall. Mr. Kiff said he needs to clarify with the Building Department as to whether the library has expansion plans, and whether the City Hall could be built in phases.

*14. Please provide a name and contact information for the Library project representative.*

Chairman Tucker thinks the best way to disseminate information is not to have anyone contact the Library Director, who is relatively new to the City, and instead to have the Library Director refer inquiries to Mr. Kiff.

*15. Please clarify process and dates for attending relevant Design Committee meetings to achieve the open public process envisioned in the RFQ.*

Chairman Tucker said that would be discussed later in the hearing protocol.

*16. Is there additional information / environmental study on the stream/swale in the Central Parcel? Clarify current activity of the stream/swale?*

Mr. Kiff said there are some biological studies that he'll post on the website.

*17. Our civil engineer is requesting a CADD file of the Hall and Forman topo. Can this be provided?*

Mr. Kiff said he would provide that to the firms if they haven't already received it.

*18. Will there be plan information provided for both the Library and Corona del Mar Plaza?*

Mr. Kiff said that plan information for the library would be provided, but that plan information for CDM Plaza, a private site, are not necessarily in our possession nor are they critical to the presentations.

*19. Will there be topological and view corridor information provided for the entire site?*

Mr. Kiff said topological information is available in detail for the Central Parcel and he'd prepare topography data for the North Parcel. Per Mr. Badum, the view corridor doesn't apply to the top site which will be a park.

20. *What is the status of the Avocado extension?*

Mr. Kiff said there has been no determination made thus far.

21. *How much room for interpretation on the site plan layout will be allowed?*

The committee did feel an answer was necessary for this question.

Mr. Kiff said the Q&A document would be updated and posted to the webpage.

NOTE: Design Teams should use the final Q&A document, posted on the website, as the final answers to each of these questions. The discussions and input summarized above was used to develop the answers and should not be interpreted as in lieu of or even supplementary to the answers posted on the Q&A document.

### **Discussion of hearing process in connection with presentation of plans of design competitors.**

Mr. Tucker referred the committee to the draft Hearing Protocol included in the agenda packet.

The committee agreed on the following:

- all plans to be presented on the same day;
- each firm will have 45 minutes for their presentations;
- the committee will have 45 minutes for Q&As for each presentation;
- presentations will start at 8:00 a.m.;
- public comments will be limited to three minutes and will take place after all five presentations, but before the committee begins any deliberations;
- the design firms will not be allowed to attend the presentations of the other firms but would be allowed to attend the open session for public comments;
- the report to City Council will be drafted by Chairman Tucker then edited by members of the committee.

Ms. Otting suggested the meeting be held all day on a Saturday instead of a Monday to allow the public opportunity to participate. She also suggested the City Council announce at their Council meetings that these City Hall Design Committee meetings are occurring. Dr. Vandersloot agreed with Ms. Otting's suggestion to have the event on a Saturday. After some discussion, the committee recommended Saturday, September 27<sup>th</sup> for the presentations and public comments, with the committee reconvening on Monday, September 29<sup>th</sup> to begin deliberations.

After further discussion about the exhibit board presentations to be displayed at City Hall and the library, Chairman Tucker appointed Ms. Taylor and Mr. Sandland to a subcommittee to decide exactly what the firms would be required to submit and what the orientation of the boards should be (NOTE: The results of their recommendations are addressed in the Q&A for this Phase and on the Website).

## **5. Adjourned to next meeting**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:04 p.m.

# # #